

### **REMARKS**

Claims 13 -17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 – 11 have been previously withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claims 8 – 12, and 18 have been cancelled pursuant to this Response. Applicant has made minor amendments to the specification and claims to overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 USC 102. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein in view of the allowed subject matter identified by the examiner in the Office Action of November 6, 2008.

### **SPECIFICATION**

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) has amended the specification according to Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, the title has been amended to read:

#### **SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE WITH IMPROVED ELECTROSTATIC TOLERANCE**

Applicant respectfully represents that the amended title is now indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112**

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims have been amended to cancel claim 18.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102**

Claims 8-12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over *Ludikhuize* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,796,146). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 13-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 13 to include the limitations of the base claim and intervening claim 12. Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 13 is now placed in a condition for allowance. Because claims 14-17 depend from independent claim 13, these claims include all of the limitations of amended claims 13. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits claims 14-17 have also been placed in a condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant(s) therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 723-0325.

Dated: February 13, 2009

By: /Gregory D. DeGrazia/  
Gregory D. Degrazia, Reg. No. 48,944  
Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC  
The Howard & Howard Center  
450 West Fourth Street  
Royal Oak, MI 48067-2557  
(248) 723-0326

GDD/tsc